Remarks

1. Summary of Office Action

In the Office Action mailed September 7, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,498,841 (Bull), and further, rejected claims 5-8, 10-13, and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over a combination of Bull and U.S. Patent No. 6,154,646 (Tran).

2. Status of Claims

Presently pending in this application are claims 1-8, 10-13, and 15-18, of which claims 1, 7, and 13 are independent and the remainder are dependent.

3. Response to § 102 Rejections

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bull.

Under M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1-4 because Bull does not disclose or suggest each and every element as recited in any of these claims.

Applicants' claimed invention is directed to a process of real-time service provisioning.

In this regard, as recited in independent claim 1 (and also in each of dependent claims 2-4 by virtue of their dependence from claim 1), the claimed process includes receiving an incoming call to a customer premises equipment at a switch in a carrier network, and *responsively sending a query for call handling instructions from the switch to a service control node in the carrier network.*

The claimed process *further includes* the limitations of: (i) providing one or more choices corresponding to handling of the incoming call for selection at the customer premises equipment *in response to receipt of the query for call handling instructions at the service control node* and (ii) receiving at the service control node an indication of a choice selected at the customer premises equipment, and *providing a response to the query from the service control node to the switch, wherein the response to the query includes call handling instructions corresponding to the selected choice.*

Applicants respectfully submit that Bull does not teach or suggest at least these claimed limitations.

In general, Bull teaches a system in which audible caller identification information is provided to a called party.

As illustrated in Bull, the system may include advanced intelligent network (AIN) components, such as (i) a service switching point (SSP) that "comprises an AIN switch that routes calls, recognizes and responds to triggers, *generates queries to obtain call information* and responds to *returned call information*", (ii) a service control point (SCP) that "comprises an AIN element that *stores call information* and *receives and responds to queries*, and (iii) a service node/intelligent peripheral (SN/IP) that "can preferably transmit messages to and receive responses from communication stations". (*See* Bull, at col. 4, lines 4-67, to col. 5, line 15).

To the extent relevant, Bull discloses a call-processing method in which an incoming call to a called party is routed to the SSP. At the SSP, a terminating attempt trigger is activated in response to the call and "[t]he trigger *generates a query that is sent to SCP 206.*" *In response to the query*, the SCP returns to the SSP *call control*

information (e.g., retrieved by the SCP from a database), where the call control information causes the SSP to route the call to the SN/IP.

In turn, the SN/IP may then generate a prompt to a calling party for spoken caller identification, such as when standard caller identification is not available. Audible caller identification information may be subsequently provided to the called party. (*See*, *e.g.*, Bull at col. 6, lines 12, to col. 7, lines 1-60, and claims 1-3, for more details).

Bull, however, does not disclose or suggest at least the claimed limitations of: (i) providing one or more choices corresponding to handling of the incoming call for selection at the customer premises equipment *in response to receipt of the query for call handling instructions at the service control node* and (ii) receiving at the service control node an indication of a choice selected at the customer premises equipment, and *providing a response to the query from the service control node to the switch, wherein the response to the query includes call handling instructions corresponding to the selected choice*.

At best, in the passage at col. 9, lines 7-42, *cited by the Examiner as disclosing these claimed limitations*, Bull generally teaches that, after the system provides the audible call information to the called party, a message including call disposition options is transmitted from the SN/IP to the called party.

In response to input provided by the called party, the SN/IP can then process the call accordingly (e.g., connect the call, cancel the call, etc.) (*See also* Bull, at col. 11, lines 11-35, where Bull similarly discloses this function of providing call disposition options to a called party and receiving a selected option from the called party).

Applicants, however, do not find in this cited passage or other disclosure in Bull any teaching or suggestion of a process in which (i) one or more choices corresponding to handling of an incoming call are provided for selection at a customer premises equipment *in response to receipt of a query for call handling instructions at a service control node*, where the query for call handling instructions is sent to the service control node from a switch in response to receiving at the switch the incoming call to the customer premises equipment, and in which (ii) an indication of a choice selected at the customer premises equipment is received at the service control node, and *a response to the query is provided from the service control node to the switch, wherein the response to the query includes call handling instructions corresponding to the selected choice.*

Advantageously, with Applicants' claimed invention, service provisioning can be carried out in real-time through a service control node (e.g., an SCP) that *receives a query for call handling instructions* from a switch (e.g., an IS-771 query), and *responds to this query with call handling instructions that correspond to a call handling choice selected at a subscriber station,* where one or more call handling choices are provided at the subscriber station *in response to receipt of the query at the service control node.*

Applicants respectfully submit that Bull does not teach or suggest this claimed invention.

Because Bull does not teach or suggest the invention as recited in any of claims 1-4, Bull fails to anticipate these claims.

4. Response to § 103 Rejections

As further noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 5-8, 10-13, and 15-18 on grounds of obviousness over a combination of Bull and Tran. Applicants traverse these

rejections, because the combination of Bull and Tran fails to disclose or suggest every element of any of these claims as would be required to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under M.P.E.P. § 2143.

For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Bull fails to teach or suggest the invention as recited in each of independent claims 7 and 13 (and also in each of dependent claims 5, 6, 8, 10-12, and 15-18 by virtue of their dependence from claim 7 or claim 13). (*See* Applicant's response filed on December 23, 2004, for how claims 5-8, 10-13, and 15-18 recite the claimed invention in various ways).

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Tran fails to overcome the deficiencies of Bull described above.

To the extent relevant, Tran teaches a system for selecting call-treatment options in real-time in a wireless network scenario. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Tran, like Bull, fails to teach or suggest at least the limitations of: (i) providing one or more choices corresponding to handling of an incoming call for selection at a customer premises equipment (e.g., a mobile station) in response to receipt of a query for call handling instructions at a service control node, where the query for call handling instructions is sent to the service control node from a switch (e.g., a mobile switching center) in response to receiving at the switch the incoming call to the customer premises equipment, and (ii) receiving at the service control node an indication of a choice selected at the customer premises equipment, and providing a response to the query from the service control node to the switch, wherein the response to the query includes call

handling instructions corresponding to the selected choice. (*See* Applicants' response filed on December 23, 2004, for a more detailed discussion regarding details of Tran).

Because the cited combination fails to disclose or suggest every element of any of claims 5-8, 10-13, and 15-18, the cited combination fails to render claims 5-8, 10-13 and 15-18 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

5. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1-8, 10-13, and 15-18 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance of those claims.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: December 7, 2005 By: Joanna Skyles

Joanna Skyles
Reg. No. 54,454